

**Road from Kudligi to Vallabapura to be taken
over by P. W. D.**

752. Sri M. M. J. SADYOJATHA (Kudligi).—

Will the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state.—

(a) whether the road from Kudligi to Vallabapura *via* Hosakeri and Dasmapura in Kudligi Taluk is proposed to be taken up by the Public Works Department;

(b) if not, the reasons for the same?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Minister for Public Works).—

(a) No.

(b) The road is considered to be not an important one.

Calling attention to a matter of Public Importance

re :—Police excesses on the Kannada Chaluvaligars at Bhadravati.

Sri ABDUL KHUDDUS ANWAR (Bhadravati) —I call the attention of the Chief Minister to the incidents that occurred on 13th and 22nd March 1969 and the Police excesses on the Kannada Chaluvaligars and several arrests made by them at Bhadravati.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—Sir, I state as follows in connection with the all attention Notices by Sriyuts : Abdul Khuddus Anwar and Sri Vatal Nagaraj. It is reported that on 19th March 1969, about 15 school going boys, both Kannadigas and Tamilians collected in Jannapura area in Bhadravati in the morning and each group was trying to extol the superiority of the films of their respective languages. But the Tamilian group of school boys who were in larger number tore some of the wall posters containing the picture of Shri Rajakumar, Kannada film actor. On the same day at about 3-30 p.m. about one hundred Kannada boys including Sri Raju, a student of Sahyadri College, Shimoga and Shivalinga, an employes of the Mysore Iron and Steel Ltd., Bhadravati collected near Jaisree Talkies, Bhadravati and tore the wall posters containing pictures of Tamil actros. As both Sri Raju and Shri Shivalinga were allegedly using indecent and abusive language, which was likely to provoke breach of peace, they were prosecuted under Section 92 (o) and (r) of the Mysore Police Act. But the procession proceeded further shouting slogans like : “M. G. R. ಗೆ ಏಕೈಕ, ಅಣ್ಣ ದೊರೆಗೆ ಏಕೈಕ, ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಜಯವಾಗಲಿ” and tore some more wall posters. On Bangalore-Honnavar Road in old Town they tore some calendars having the photographs of Tamil actors in a shop called “S. G. Sound System” and also damaged some Tamil books kept in the shop for sale.

Police intervened and the processionists after proceeding further dispersed at about 6-00 P.M. without any further incidents.

On 21st March 1969, the two petty charge sheets under Section 92 (o & r) of Mysore Police Act against Raju and Shivalinga were taken on file in the Court of Munsiff Magistrate as C. C. Nos. 502 and 503/69. On the same day, at about 1-30 P.M. Sriyuths H. B. Veerabasappa, H. N. Sathyanarayana, Viswanatha Kote, Krishnappa and Ibrahim, residents of Bhadravati town, ascertained to be Kannada Chaluvaligars, approached the Circle Inspector, Bhadravati, and requested him to withdraw the petty cases launched against Sriyuths: Raju and Shivalinga. This could not be done as the Circle Inspector had no powers to do so.

On 22nd March 1969 at about 4-00 P.M. about 150 persons, mostly school boys led by Sriyuths: Raju, Shivalinga, Thimmegowda, Gangadhar, B. H. Mayanna, Ibrahim, Krishna and others started in a procession from Hutha colony in New Town area, Bhadravathi to protest against the launching of petty cases by the local police against Sri Raju and Sri Shivalinga. They were carrying banners containing the words: ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಜಯವಾಗಲಿ, ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರ ಮೇಲೆ ದಬ್ಬಾಳಿಕೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಲಿ, etc. They were shouting slogans like “ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಜಯವಾಗಲಿ, ತಮಿಳರಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕಾರ, ಅಜ್ಞಾಪೊರೆಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕಾರ, ಪೊಲೀಸರಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕಾರ” The Circle Inspector made adequate police bandobust. The processionists reached “Madawachar Circle” near Old Town P. S. at about 7-00 P.M. By this time their number had increased to 300. From this point the processionists turned back and as they were proceeding on the Bhadra River bridge shouting slogans, about 100 Tamilians came from opposite direction carrying the portrait of late Shri Annadurai. Some of them were armed with sticks and shouting slogans. ಅಜ್ಞಾಪೊರೆವಾಳಿಗೆ D M. K. ಗೆ ಜಯವಾಗಲಿ. There was immediate likelihood of a clash. The Police force accompanying the procession intervened and warned them to disperse. Still both the processionists continued to shout slogans and started pelting stones. A mild lath-charge was resorted to. Nobody is reported to have been injured as a result of lathi charge. Police pickets were posted at strategic points in Bhadravati Town.

It is reported that there was no incident on 13th March 1969.

It is further reported that a Committee of leaders of various parties in Bhadravati held a meeting on 23rd March 1969 and condemned the incidents that took place.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—The Hon. Chief Minister, was pleased to state that a mild lathi-charge was resorted to, but nobody was injured. I would like to know whether there is any truth in such a statement because any lathi-Charge will always injure some person. In fact, lathi charge is meant to injure somebody and disperse the crowd. I have not heard of any lathi charge in which nobody was injured. I want to know whether it is simply a version given by the Police or whether it is a true version.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Here, whatever information I have collected I have placed before this House. The information I have collected goes to show that there was a mild lathi charge. It is not necessary that lathi charge should be followed by injuries on the bodies of persons or anything like that. Lathi charge is made only with a view to disperse the crowd. The Police generally make some light lathi charge or cane charge and when the crowd is not at all violent and when it has dispersed, I do not think the Police unnecessarily resort to lathi charge just to injure the persons.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I make a humble submission? It is most unfortunate that such linguistic troubles, communal troubles and all those unhappy incidents are raising their ugly heads of late, almost in an increasing measure. May I request the Hon. Chief Minister to direct his local officers to be cautious and take timely action because as the adage goes: a stitch in time saves nine. In this unfortunate case, why should the name of the Late Sri Anna Durai, who is a respected leader of the country and who is no more, have been brought in, is a point I cannot understand. These matters should not be carried to such an excess. After all, Mysore is a multilingual State. We do not think that this will be conducive to the interests of the state. I am also of the view that such incidents should not be given any publicity. If at all there are any cases wherein the interests of the public will suffer, they should not be disclosed. In future, at least it is better that such incidents which occur here and there, should not be given undue publicity.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I fully agree with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa. I, on my own, did not make this statement. I was not at all prepared to make a statement on this matter in the House. My attention was called to the matter through a Call Attention Notice. When the Hon. Speaker directs me to make a statement. I have no option but to make statement. I fully agree that these incidents should not get any publicity at all. If the hon. Member's wish is that these communal clashes and linguistic incidents should not be given any publicity, then the best course would be to elicit information outside the House, and not inside the House. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to give as much information as possible to the Hon. Members outside the House but not on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will go according to the List of Business. After the laying of papers is over I shall make an announcement regarding the stages for the Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill. Now Sri Mohamed Ali, Hon. Minister for Transport, will lay papers on the Table.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಪ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ).—ರಾನು ಬಾಮ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ವೋಷ್‌ವ್ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. ಅದೇನಾಯಿತು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಭೆ ಕೂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅದರ ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಅವರು ರೂಂ 59 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಡಿಸ್ಮಿಷನ್ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಡಿಸ್ಮಿಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಅರ್ಹತೆ ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ 1.55ಕ್ಕೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾರೂ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ಎರಡನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರ ಸರಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಬಾಂಡ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಕಣದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು 10 ತಿಂಗಳು ಕೊಡದೇ ನಿಂತಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಡಿಸ್ಮಿಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. As regards Kalman- kar's notice I shall, at the most, permit a call-attention motion; it cannot be a matter for adjournment motion.

Notice of Privilege motion against the Statement of Sri S. K. Patil

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—Sir, you said that you would allot a day for the discussion of the Privilege Motion against S. K. Patil. Being a top ranking Congress man, somehow or other this discussion is evaded. I feel this is a fit matter to be taken for consideration here. If he has said anything which is derogatory to the honour, dignity and decorum of this house, he must be taught a lesson. So, when exactly are you allotting time for it?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon. Members know that according to the announcement made by me two days back, two days were allotted for the Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill. What has happened during the last two days is known to all. I have brought to the notice of the Business Advisory Committee that some more time is required for this Bill. Therefore it was decided to give a third day for this bill. Accordingly, 10th which is the last day has also been allotted for it. I wanted to give a full day for an educative debate on the Law of Privileges etc. But when I placed this matter before the Business Advisory Committee, it was not acceptable to them and it was decided that it could be taken up at the next session. Now I request the leaders to kindly explain the position in this behalf.

Sri H. SIDDHAVEERAPPA.—Sir, it is no doubt true that in the Business Advisory Committee it was thought that two days' time might be sufficient and that, if necessary, third day might be given for this Bill. It is now found that even three days may not be sufficient in order to fulfil the work and may be, it may be necessary to allot one more day. I do not know whether anything more is necessary or permissible. Likewise we were also anxious that there should be an educative debate on the Law of Privileges but in view of the rush of work